

Tukwila Tree and Environment Advisory Committee

Meeting Notes

Meeting 1, September 13, 2016

Committee Members in Attendance: Sean Albert, Nancy Eklund, De'Sean Quinn, Don Scanlon, Sharon Mann, Heidi Watters, Kathleen Wilson, Genevieve Christensen

Committee Members Absent: Stephen Reilly

Members of the Public in Attendance: Gordon Manley

Staff in Attendance: Andrea Cummins, Nora Gierloff, Carol Lumb

The meeting began at 6:05 p.m.

Topics of Discussion:

1. Brief introductions of committee members and staff, members of the public in attendance.
2. Public comment: (Time will be set aside at the beginning of each meeting for brief public comments; the Committee is meeting in work session format, therefore, questions or comments from the public that come up during the course of the meeting should be directed to staff via e-mail or telephone calls after the meeting.)
 - Gordon Manley introduced himself. He asked the Committee to consider the use of dwarf and semi-dwarf trees on parcels where there isn't much room for planting. There are a number of new cultivars that are small to medium in size. He has 19 trees on his property, medium to small in size. Mr. Manley is on the interested party email list and hopes to attend more of the Advisory Committee meetings.
 - An email dated August 20, 2016 from Daryl Tapio with attached comments he provided in 2012/2013 when the Committee was working on the Comprehensive Plan goals and policies was provided to each Committee member.
3. Housekeeping items:
 - a. The meeting notes for each meeting will be prepared by staff.
 - b. The Committee will continue to meet starting at 6:00 p.m. and going until 8:30 p.m.
 - c. The next meeting will be September 29th – October meetings to be identified through a Doodle Poll.
 - d. Councilmember Quinn commented that he is the Committee chair, but his role is to facilitate. The group deliberated last time and reached consensus on issues – it is the goal to use this same process again to reach recommendations to pass on to the Planning Commission.
4. Review began of the draft landscaping code. A revised version which includes more side bar notes identifying the sources used to develop the draft code was handed out to Committee members.
5. It was suggested that the draft regulations be pared down and simplified to avoid wasting applicant time and money when trying to determine what regulations apply to a project – Committee members were asked to send suggestions to staff on how they would like to see the chapter organized. In addition, when the new code is adopted by the City Council, a hand out will be prepared to provide key requirements of the new landscape code.

Tukwila Tree and Environment Advisory Committee

Meeting Notes

6. The rationale of the proposed regulations needs to be explained as much as possible.
7. The chart that is found on pages 2 and 3 appears to be missing the required landscaping for second fronts – staff will check and correct.
8. There are several errors in the revisions to landscaping identified in the chart. For NCC, the current requirement of 0 landscaping on the sides and fronts is proposed to be retained because these lots tend to be small and additional landscaping will be obtained through the increase in landscaping required in parking lots. For the RC and RCM districts, the proposal is to keep 0 landscaping in the rear, with the same rationale as for NCC. The Committee agreed with this approach.
9. It was suggested that the landscaping required in parking lots be added to the table – staff will work on integrating this.
10. The Committee discussed Note #11, which allows community gardens to be substituted for some or all of the landscaping. The Committee directed that if a community garden is substituted for front landscaping along the public street, there must be 5 feet of formal landscaping before the community garden can be established. Staff will also look at adding a community garden definition to the code that better identifies the criteria for when a community garden would be approved.
11. Are there incentives that can be used to obtain additional landscaping, such as allowing additional height, varying the setbacks or allowing property owner to use undeveloped right of way for landscaping purposes.
12. Need staff guidance on how to achieve the canopy goals, particularly if no increase in landscaping will occur until there is redevelopment of a site. How will the 3-6% increase in canopy be achieved? Need a balanced, easily enforced code.
13. Discussion about substituting bioretention facilities for landscaping – the many forms these facilities can take and that if the side slopes are steep the facility would not really resemble a landscaping area. It was suggested that bioretention facilities not be allowed to substitute for front landscaping and also to put right up front that they can only be used to substitute for Type I and II landscaping – not Type III. Criteria for approval of substituting bioretention facilities for landscaping, on page 18, may also need to be tightened up.

Action Items

1. Staff will send out a Doodle Poll to identify meeting dates in October.
2. The next meeting will pick up on page 4, TMC 18.52.030, Perimeter Landscaping Types.

The meeting closed at 8:15 pm.